UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/229,592	01/13/1999	BRIAN S. DOYLE	42390.P5578	5730

7590 07/19/2002

MICHAEL A BERNADICOU
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER
BROCK II, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/229,592	Applicant(s) DOYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul E Brock II	Art Unit 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 28-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 28-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on *19 June 2002* is: a)☒ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on June 19, 2002. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1 – 12, 16, 29, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodder et al. (USPAT 6063677, Rodder) in view of Sekine et al. (USPAT 5937300, Sekine) and Ishida et al. (USPAT 6051473, Ishida).

Rodder discloses a method of forming a transistor in figures 3a – 5.

In figure 3a Rodder disclose forming an alignment component (120 and 122) on a substrate (102) of a semiconductor material. Rodder discloses in figure 3b and column 3, lines 5 – 40 depositing a metal layer (106) over the substrate. Rodder discloses in column 3, lines 5 – 40 that the metal layer could also be a silicide layer. Rodder discloses in column 3, lines 15 – 16 that the silicide regions are self aligned to the disposable gate. It is an inherent feature of silicide regions that are self aligned to the disposable gate would extend up to the disposable gate and have inner surfaces which face one another. In figures 3e and 3f Rodder discloses removing the alignment component. In figures 3e – 5 and column 5, lines 11 –26 Rodder discloses replacing the removed alignment component with a conductive gate (112) inherently substantially extending up to the silicide regions. Rodder teaches in column 3, lines 27 – 32 that the silicide regions are formed by the salicide (self-aligned silicide regions) process. Rodder is silent to

steps in the salicide process, however, the salicide process is well known in the art. Sekine teaches in figures 13b – 13d the salicide process. Sekine teaches in figure 13b and column 2, lines 1 – 30 depositing a metal layer (813) over a substrate (801) and an alignment component (805, 804 and 810). Sekine further teaches in figures 13b – 13c and column 2, lines 1 – 30 of reacting the metal layer with the semiconductor material of the substrate to form two silicide regions (814) that are self aligned to the alignment component, the silicide regions having inner surfaces which face one another, wherein an upper portion of each inner surface contacts the alignment component and a lower portion of each inner surface contacts the semiconductor material of the substrate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the salicide process steps of Sekine that include lower and upper portions of silicide regions in the method of Rodder in order to use a well known and highly understood method of forming the silicide layers that will reduce interconnect resistance of the polysilicon lines. Because Rodder discloses in column 3, lines 15 – 16 that the raised source and drain regions are self aligned to the disposable gate it is further obvious that the silicide regions of the combined method of Rodder and Sekine would produce silicide regions having inner surfaces which face one another, wherein an upper portion of each inner surface contacts the alignment component and a lower portion of each inner surface contacts the semiconductor material of the substrate. Rodder and Sekine do not disclose that the alignment component consists of a single material. Ishida teaches in figures 5a – 5e an alignment component (507) consisting of a single material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the alignment component consisting of a

single material of Ishida in the method of Rodder and Sekine in order to remove the alignment component in one step as taught by Ishida in figures 5a – 5e and column 6, lines 38 – 59.

With regard to claims 2 – 4, Rodder discloses in columns 2 and 3, lines 59 – 67 and 1- 4 respectively that the alignment component includes silicon oxide which inherently posses the properties of being non-conductive, and in non-reactive with the metal layer when the metal layer is reacted with the semiconductor material of the substrate.

With regard to claims 5, 6 and 8, Rodder discloses in column 2, lines 11 – 17 that the alignment component is less than .10 microns wide. It is inherent that the alignment component has a thickness of between 1000Å and 2500Å. It is inherent that the metal layer is between 300Å and 400Å thick.

With regard to claim 7, Sekine discloses that the metal layer includes titanium in column 2, lines 4 – 6.

With regard to claim 9, Sekine discloses in figure 13c that the silicide regions have lower surfaces located lower than a lower surface of the alignment component.

With regard to claim 10, Rodder discloses in figures 3c – 5 a method wherein the alignment component is removed. In figure 3c Rodder discloses depositing a layer (114) over the silicide regions and the alignment component. In column 3, lines 46 – 49 Rodder discloses planarizing the layer at least until the alignment component is exposed. In figures 3e– 5 Rodder discloses etching the alignment component at least until the substrate is exposed to leave an opening between the inner surfaces of the silicide regions to allow for formation of the gate (112).

With regard to claim 11, it would be obvious in the method of Rodder, Sekine and Ishida further comprising exposing the upper portions of the inner surfaces after the etching of the alignment component,. Because the alignment component and the upper portions of the inner surfaces are in contact as applied to claim 1, when the alignment component is removed, the upper portions of the inner surfaces would be exposed.

With regard to claim 12, Rodder discloses in columns 2 and 3, lines 59 – 67 and 1 – 52 respectively the alignment component and the layer are of different materials, one being of silicon oxide and the other being of silicon nitride.

With regard to claim 16, Rodder discloses in figure 4 forming doped regions (104) which extend from the silicide regions in underneath the gate.

Claims 29 and 32 are rejected similar to at least claims 4 and 9 – 12, respectively, with regard to Rodder, Sekine and Ishida, above. It is inherent that the silicide regions form a Schottky junction.

With regard to claim 30, it is further obvious in the method of Rodder, Sekine and Ishida that a portion of the metal layer above the alignment component is removed after the metal layer is reacted with the semiconductor material of the substrate.

3. Claims 13 – 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodder, Sekine and Ishida as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Inumiya et al. (USPAT 6054355, Inumiya).

With regard to claims 13, Rodder discloses in figure 5, and column 4, lines 56 – 67 depositing a gate dielectric layer (110), and forming a gate electrode on the gate dielectric layer.

Rodder does not disclose forming a dielectric layer that would be sufficient in Rodder, Sekine and Ishida because the dielectric layer of Rodder would not insulate the entire upper portion of the inner surface of the silicide regions of Rodder, Sekine and Ishida. Inumiya teaches in figure 10g depositing a gate dielectric layer (116) lining the inside of a groove (114) formed by the removal of an alignment feature, and forming a gate electrode (117) on the gate dielectric layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the gate dielectric layer of Inumiya in the method of Rodder, Sekine and Ishida in order to form a gate insulating film and a gate electrode in a groove formed by the removal of an alignment feature.

With regard to claims 14 and 31, it is further obvious in the method of Rodder, Sekine, Masuoka and Inumiya that the gate dielectric could be less than 10Å thick. The gate dielectric could be less than 10Å thick in order to facilitate the gate requirements for the decreasing dimensions of semiconductor devices.

With regard to claim 15, Rodder discloses that the gate electrode includes a metal in column 4, lines 64 – 67.

4. Claims 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodder, Sekine, Ishida and Inumiya as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Gardner et al. (USPAT 6051865, Gardner).

With regard to claims 17 and 18, Rodder, Sekine, Ishida and Inumiya do not disclose using a high K dielectric layer. Gardner teaches in columns 3 and 4, lines 24 – 40 and 24-36 respectively a gate dielectric layer of barium strontium titanate that has a dielectric constant of at

least 100. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the low K dielectric material of Gardner in the method of Rodder, Sekine, Ishida and Inumiya in order to decrease the transistor threshold voltage as stated by Gardner in column 3, lines 26 – 33.

With regard to claim 19, Rodder, Sekine, Ishida, Inumiya and Gardner do not disclose using platinum as a gate electrode. It is well known in the art to form a gate electrode of platinum. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the platinum gate electrode in the process of forming a transistor of Rodder, Sekine, Ishida, Inumiya and Gardner in order to use a low-resistivity conductor for the gate material.

5. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodder, Sekine and Ishida as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wolf (Silicon Processing for the VLSI ERA, Vol. 2).

Rodder, Sekine and Ishida obviously disclose that the silicide regions extend partially below the alignment component because that is a property of the silicide process as disclosed by the references. Rodder, Sekine and Ishida do not disclose that the metal layer includes nickel. Wolf teaches on pages 146 a salicide formed from nickel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the cobalt salicide of Wolf in the method of Rodder, Sekine an Ishida in order to create a silicide that exhibits lower resistivities as taught by Wolf on page 146.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed June 19, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to the applicant's argument that "metal layer 106 is not deposited over the alignment component... but rather placed only to the sides of the alignment component," it should be noted that the salicide process disclosed in column 3, lines 5 – 40 in Rodder as a way to form the regions 106 includes depositing a metal layer over the alignment component. This process is highlighted in detail, and included in the rejection, by Sekine in figures 13b – 13c and column 2, lines 1 – 30. Further, Wolf again details the well-known process of salicidation. As applied to this rejection the salicide process includes at least: blanket depositing a metal layer over the entire wafer (including the alignment component), heating the wafer to react the metal with the substrate forming a self-aligned salicide and removing the unreacted metal. This is called the salicide process, and is well known in the art as demonstrated and relied upon by Rodder, Sekine and Wolf. Therefore the rejection is proper.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E Brock II whose telephone number is (703)308-6236. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703)308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Paul E Brock II
July 15, 2002

EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800